**CHAPTER 1**

1. Nature of Argumentation
	1. Argumentation defined:
	2. Argumentation vs Persuasion
	3. ELM (Elaboration Likelihood Model)
		1. The “peripheral route”
		2. The “central route”
	4. Argumentation occurs when there is disagreement and/or search for knowledge
	5. It is a rule-governed activity
2. Nature of the Audience
	1. Audience defined:
	2. “Field of Argument” defined:
	3. Common Bonds (among audience members)
		1. Demographic characteristics:
		2. Psychographic characteristics:
3. Ethical Standards (for Argumentation)
	1. Clarity
	2. Honesty
	3. Efficiency
	4. Relevance
	5. Discourse Ethics

**CHAPTER 2**

# Argumentation & Debate

# Chapter 2 – Lecture

## I. Characteristics of Argumentation

* Characteristics of the Argumentation Process:
	1. it is a social activity
	2. it is an intellectual activity
	3. it is a verbal activity
	4. it is opinion stating, justifying, or refuting
	5. it is directed towards an audience

**II. Fields of Argument**

1. **definition:** a social or professional context in which

people argue in order to make decisions or build a body of knowledge

1. Field “Dependant” and “Independent” Variables
	1. **Field Dependant:**
2. elements that are particular to that field ***alone.***
3. standards for proof or reasoning, what

constitutes “sound” argument,

what “makes sense”.

* (i.e. Historian’s research sources **#** *vs.*

Biologist’s research sources **#**)

* 1. **Field Invariant:**
		+ elements that ***do not*** typically change as we

move from field to field.

**III. Presumption**

**definition:** All argumentation takes place over a piece of figurative ground occupied by existing institutions, ideas, laws, policies, and customs.

***Presumption*** is the term that specifies who occupies this ground at the beginning of the controversy.

 The Negative has Presumption

**IV. Burden of Proof**

**definition:**  This is the obligation of the Affirmative (a.k.a. advocate, prosecution) to contest the ground by offering arguments that are logically sufficient to challenge presumption (status quo).

The AFF has the Burden of Proof.

**V. the “Prime Facie” Case**

**definition:** The **prime facie case**  is the one that “at first sight” or “on the face of it” is sufficient to justify changing belief or behavior. (i.e. think of “Indictments” they must get in court cases)

**CHAPTER 3**

# Argumentation & Debate

# Chapter 3 – Lecture

**I. Propositions**

## definition: A proposition is a statement of the

## decision that the Affirmative (prosecution) wants.

1. **Characteristics of Propositions:**
	1. It must be controversial
	2. It must involve only **one** central idea
	3. It must be stated in **neutral terms** so there is no advantage for one side or the other based on the language you use.
	4. It must provide a **clear & concise**  statement of

the decision desired by the advocate (affirmative).

* 1. It must **place *presumption* and *burden of proof***

**correctly**. The affirmative (advocate) has the burden of proof, the negative (defense attorney) has presumption.

1. **Types of Propositions**
	1. **Proposition of Fact:**
		1. This is a statement which asserts the appropriate way to

view reality or seek knowledge.

* + 1. The advocate (affirmative) argues that something is true,

whereas the negative (defense) says it’s false.

* + 1. This type of propositions **seeks to alter our beliefs**.

EXAMPLE: *“Joe Brown is guilty of murder.”*

* 1. **Proposition of Value:**
		1. This is a statement which discusses somethings

worth or inherent value.

* + 1. This is a statement which argues that something is *bad* or *undesirable,* and the negative argues that it is *good* or *desirable.*
		2. This type of propositions **seeks to alter our beliefs**.

EXAMPLE: *“American commercial broadcasters have sacrificed quality for entertainment.”*

* 1. **Proposition of Policy:**
		1. This is a statement that calls for some course of action.
		2. The advocate (affirmative) says some action or

policy should be adopted, the negative (defense) says the status quo is ok.

* + 1. This type of propositions **seeks to change our behavior**.

EXAMPLE: *“The federal government should control the supply and utilization of energy in the United States.”*

**II. Defining Terms**

1. **Rules of Definition**
	1. The Inclusionary Rule – Include relevant material
	2. The Exclusionary Rule – Exclude irrelevant material
	3. The Adaptation Rule – make sure you use the most appropriate definition
	4. The Neutrality Rule – Use language without emotional undertones
	5. The Specificity Rule – Don’t use the word in its definition
	6. The Clarity Rule – Keep it simple; Don’t confuse us with the definitions
2. **Terms Needing Definition**
	1. Equivocal Terms: terms with two or more equally correct meanings.
	2. Vague Terms: terms that lack clear-cut definitions; they have shades of meaning
	3. Technical Terms: jargon or specialized words belonging to a particular field
	4. New Terms: additions to the language; words or phrases that do not exist to common vocabulary
	5. Coined Terms: terms that are invented when a convenient term does not already exist